



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BOOK REVIEWS

METHODS AND PRINCIPLES

Die ethnologische Wirtschaftsforschung: eine historisch-kritische Studie.

P. WILH. KOPPERS, S. V. D. (*Anthropos*, vol. x-xi, 1915-16, pp. 971-1079.)

Owing to the present capriciousness of trans-Atlantic transportation, the predecessors of the above-cited concluding instalment of a longer article remain inaccessible to the reviewer. Since, however, it constitutes an independent unit and embodies theoretical views of considerable importance, it seems permissible to furnish a brief indication of its contents.

Father Koppers, as his subtitle indicates, is concerned mainly with an historical summary of past opinions, together with a critical appreciation of past achievements. He has taken enormous trouble to represent with accuracy the views of many writers whose activities fall beyond the sphere of ethnology proper, such as geographers, historians, and economists; and it is impossible not to accord the highest praise to the manner in which he has acquitted himself of his arduous task. If any criticism is to be offered as to the form of his presentation, the reviewer would suggest somewhat greater compactness. Inasmuch as Father Koppers is not, after all, offering a psychology of scholarly investigation, much space might have been saved by a purely topical discussion instead of the inevitably lumbering method of considering each thinker individually.

The author's general point of view is that of Graebner, especially as later adopted by Father Schmidt. The latter, it appears, has developed a comprehensive scheme of cultural history, interrupted in publication by the war but largely drawn upon by Koppers. Indeed, the exposition of Schmidt's conceptions and the critique of Hahn (979 *seq.*, 1056 *seq.*) will prove of greatest interest to the readers of this journal.

As for Hahn's conceptions, Koppers accepts his critique of the time-honored three-stage theory, but repudiates the notion that pastoral life represents a secondary development from an agricultural mode of subsistence and the hypothesis that all domestication is based on that of the ox. Further the author rejects as superfluous and inherently improb-

able Hahn's view that religious motives were instrumental in the primeval processes of domestication. Not that he postulates an intentional compulsory act: he rather reverts to occasional suggestions of Hahn himself relating to the corralling of game animals by hunting tribes (p. 992).

Schmidt's theory is expounded as follows (pp. 988, 1056). Graebner had assumed a bifurcation of cultural evolution from the primeval hunting state. As one branch he postulated a matrilineal moiety system correlated with the origin of horticulture through female effort; as another a patrilineal totemistic culture, from which he derived the civilization of pastoral peoples. It is this genetic connection between stock-breeding and totemism that Schmidt denies. In his scheme pastoral conditions represent a third independent post-primeval cultural province, that of northern Central Asia (southwestern Siberia). The marginal peoples whose culture represents that from which pastoralism evolved are the Eskimo, Lapps, Ainu, *et al.* Schmidt distinguishes three pastoral groups. The northeastern division embraces the bulk of Ural-Altaian stocks and the core of the cultural province; to these peoples must be credited the domestication of the reindeer, the horse, and the camel. The Indo-Europeans form the central group, their home being placed in northern Turkistan and southern Russia. As an as yet undifferentiated stock (*als einheitliches Gesamtvolk*) they adopted husbandry, though only in slight degree, from neolithic neighbors in Turkistan. Finally Schmidt recognizes a southwestern division of Hamito-Semitic nomads, who only secondarily borrowed domesticated species from the two other groups.

A disturbing feature of Father Koppers' argumentation consists in the constant assumption of Graebner's cultural strata as definitely established historical facts. Yet it is quite possible to accept the notion of cultural stratification without recognizing in Graebner's totemistic and two-class cultures anything but speculative constructions. Apart from this important qualification, the reviewer gladly hails this paper not only as a learned and able essay on one of the most important aspects of material culture but also as embodying a number of eminently just methodological aperçus.

ROBERT H. LOWIE

POSTSCRIPT

Since writing the above I have had an opportunity of reading the first part of Father Koppers' study (*Anthropos*, vols. X-XI, 1915-16, pp. 611-651). It contains a number of interesting historical points. In opposition to Roscher, who ascribes the origin of the three-stage

theory to Plato, Koppers finds that Plato recognizes but two epochs, that of the hunting herders being distinguished from tillers of the soil. The earliest representative of the theory seems to be Dicaearchus, a disciple of Aristotle who died about 320 B.C. In his scheme the first period is that of a paradisaical golden age, while some other writers of antiquity substitute an animal-like existence. Later speculators inclined definitely to the familiar classification into a hunting, a pastoral, and an agricultural stage, such as is found in Adam Smith's epoch-making work. This scheme was first challenged in 1786 by I. Iselin, apparently a Swiss writer, who noted the absence of cattle among the Maori as contrary to the assumed sequence. He thus preceded A. von Humboldt, who utilized primarily American data in rejecting the necessity of an intermediate pastoral stage.

In the four decades following the middle of the nineteenth century the author recognizes two antagonistic tendencies, the evolutionary and the historical. Koppers is severe, though not unjust, in his treatment of Morgan and his slavish followers; he explains the belated retention of the three-stage theory in France by the preoccupation of French scholars with archaeological rather than ethnological data. However, Koppers insists that Hahn exaggerates in assuming that the acceptance of the old scheme was everywhere general during this period. For one thing, the older historical school of political economists, notably Hildebrandt, Knies, and Roscher, entertained sound methodological principles hostile to a priori constructions of stages. Miss Buckland distinguished a lower and a higher form of husbandry and assumed a more or less historical position. Among other things she associated women with primitive tillage, a conclusion already clearly set forth in Bachofen's famous work. Finally Nowacki and Ling Roth are mentioned as anticipating some of the results of modern ethnology.

R. H. L.

Americanization. Carol Aronovici. Keller Publishing Co., St. Paul, 1918. Pp. 62.

Dr. Aronovici's book on Americanization is an attempt to give a scientific basis to the problem of racial amalgamation.

In the first place, he shows that a deliberate Americanization plan, in the sense of an attempt to force the ideas and ideals of ourselves upon other peoples, is not essentially different in spirit or aim from the Germanization schemes that we have vigorously denounced. The same nationality fever is largely responsible for both of them.